
From: Scott Kreiter
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2008 4:31 PM
To: Bob Clubb; Camille Pleasants; Chuck James; David Turner (david.turner@ferc.gov); Frank Winchell; Glenn Hartmann (glenn@crcwa.com); Gordon Brett; Guy Moura; John Devine; Margaret Berger (margaret@crcwa.com); Mary Mayo; Richard Bailey; Rob Whitlam; Robert Easton; Sally Sovey; Scott Kreiter; Shane Bickford; Timothy Bachelder
Subject: Wells Relicensing: Cultural RWG meeting materials
Attachments: CRWG_Agenda_013008.pdf; STEPS_FOR_SECTION_106_COMPLIANCE 013008.pdf; Draft_HPMP_Outline.pdf

Cultural Resource Work Group members –

Please find attached a draft HPMP outline for discussion purposes during our meeting on Wednesday. I've also included the agenda and the Section 106 schedule again...just in case.

See you on Wednesday at 10 AM.

-Scott

From: Scott Kreiter
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 2:29 PM
To: Bob Clubb; Camille Pleasants; Chuck James; David Turner (david.turner@ferc.gov); Frank Winchell; Glenn Hartmann (glenn@crcwa.com); Gordon Brett; Guy Moura; John Devine; Margaret Berger (margaret@crcwa.com); Mary Mayo; Richard Bailey; Rob Whitlam; Robert Easton; Sally Sovey; Scott Kreiter; Shane Bickford; Timothy Bachelder
Subject: Wells Relicensing: Cultural RWG meeting agenda

Cultural Resource Work Group members –

Please find attached the agenda for the January 30 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting. The meeting will be held from 10:00 AM – noon in Nespelem. Those attending by conference call can find the dial-up number in the agenda.

The main purpose of the meeting is to update the participants on the two studies that are underway. The two studies are: 1) the TCP study (initiated in January, 2007); and 2) the Cultural Resources Investigation / Field Reconnaissance (initiated in July 2007). We will also discuss the Wells ILP Section 106 schedule (attached) and begin discussing Historic Properties Management Plan concepts as time allows.

Please contact me if you have any questions about the meeting.

Thanks.

-Scott

Scott Kreiter
Douglas County PUD
509-881-2327

Agenda

Cultural Resource Work Group

Wells Hydroelectric Project Relicensing
Douglas County PUD
January 30, 2008
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Meeting Location: Nespelem

Conference Dial-in: 509-881-2990 PIN# 327831

Meeting Coordinator: Scott Kreiter (509) 881-2327

Meeting Objective: To provide an update on the Cultural Resource Investigation and TCP studies. To begin HPMP discussions.

Time	Topic	Lead
10:00 am	Review agenda and meeting objectives	Scott Kreiter
10:05 am	Review relicensing/Section 106 timeline	Scott Kreiter
10:20 am	Study updates (TCP & Cultural Resource Investigation)	CCT
11:00 am	HPMP concepts	Scott Kreiter
11:45 am	Action Items and next steps	Scott Kreiter
12:00 pm	Adjourn	

WELLS RELICENSING STEPS FOR SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE

January 30, 2008

TASK		DESCRIPTION	ILP Schedule	Date Accomplished
1	Identify interested parties and stakeholders (36 CFR 800.3(c))	FERC and/or Douglas PUD should identify any tribes, agencies, or other interested parties who have an interest in cultural resources related to the Wells relicensing.	<u>October, 2005</u> : Stakeholder outreach	<u>August 8, 2005</u> : Information Request Letter <u>October 4, 2005</u> : Douglas PUD met with CCT Business Council <u>October 18, 2005</u> : ILP Information Meeting <u>November 18, 2005</u> : First Work Group Meeting
2	Establish policy-level consultation (36 CFR 800.2(c)(ii))	FERC should initiate policy-level consultation with agencies and tribes. FERC may decide to delegate day-to-day consultation to Douglas PUD.	<u>January, 2007</u> : Initial tribal consultation meeting	<u>December 7, 2005</u> : FERC sent delegation letter to RWG <u>May 16, 2006</u> : FERC Initial Tribal Consultation Meeting in Nespelem
3	Define Area of Potential Effect (APE) (36 CFR 800.4(a))	Define the area where cultural resources may be impacted by ongoing project operations. Seek formal concurrence from SHPO and THPO.	<u>January – March, 2006</u> : Pre-ILP consultation	<u>July 18, 2006</u> : Letters to THPO and SHPO seeking concurrence <u>July 25, 2006</u> : SHPO concurrence letter to Douglas PUD <u>October 25, 2006</u> : THPO concurrence letter to Douglas PUD
4	Background research to identify the scope of identification efforts (36 CFR 800.4(a)(2, 3, 4))	A professional archaeological/historic consultant conducts research to summarize previously completed studies in the Project area to obtain an understanding of what is known about historic use in the APE. This information is used to scope additional studies.	<u>March – September, 2006</u> : Gather information for PAD <u>November, 2006</u> : ILP Study Plans Due	<u>December 2006</u> : Wells Cultural Resources Data Review finalized <u>December 2006</u> : Cultural Resources Investigation included in PAD and filed with FERC
5	Study scoping: Identify historic properties (36 CFR 800.4(b)(1))	Develop scope of work for any studies planned to be implemented during the ILP two year study phase.	<u>September 2006 – October 2007</u> : ILP study scoping and FERC Study Plan Determination	<u>May 2007</u> : Scope of work finalized <u>October 11, 2007</u> : FERC issued study plan determination approving study plan
6	Phase I Study – Inventory (36 CFR 800.4(b)(1))	The entire APE is assessed and surveyed for cultural resources by walking transects at pre-determined intervals to identify potential sites. A qualified consultant conducts research to determine if any TCPs exist in the APE.	<u>2008</u> : Conduct 1 st season of studies <u>October 2008</u> : File Initial Study Report	<u>January 2007</u> : TCP study initiated <u>July 2007</u> : Cultural Resources Investigation initiated
7	Phase II Study - Evaluation of site eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (36 CFR 800.4(c))	The Section 106 parties will determine what level of site evaluation is needed to evaluate NRHP eligibility.	<u>2009</u> : Conduct 2 nd season of studies <u>October, 2009</u> : File Updated Study Report	
8	Assess adverse effects (36 CFR 800.5)	The Section 106 parties will assess the effects of ongoing Project operations on historic properties and develop treatments.	<u>December, 2009</u> : Preliminary Licensing Proposal Due	
9	Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP)	Douglas PUD will consult with the Section 106 parties to develop a Historic Properties Management Plan for incorporation into the new license.	<u>May, 2010</u> : License Application Filed	
10	Programmatic Agreement (36 CFR 800.14)	FERC develops and distributes a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for signature that commits the Licensee to implement the HPMP. This also documents FERC's completion of Section 106 and allows the SHPO and THPO to sign off on FERC's assessment of Project effects on historic properties.	<u>February, 2011</u> : FERC Issues Draft HPMP with draft NEPA document	

Wells Project Draft HPMP Outline
For discussion at the January 30 CRWG meeting

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Project Description and Background

1.2 Scope and Purpose of the HPMP

1.2.1 Cultural Resource Work Group

1.2.2 Area of Potential Effect

1.3 Legislative Mandates and Relicensing Requirements [*Brief overview of NHPA, with list of applicable laws and regs in an appendix*]

2.0 Identifying Historic Properties [*This section summarizes studies that were used as the basis for this HPMP. Other studies will be summarized in an appendix*]

2.1 Historic Properties Studies

2.1.1 Data Review, 2006

2.1.2 Traditional Cultural Properties Study, 2007

2.1.3 Cultural Resources Field Reconnaissance and Survey, 2007-2008

3.0 Managing Historic Properties

3.1 Coordination [*Designates coordinator and training requirements*]

3.2 Education and Interpretation

3.2.1 Employee Education Program

3.2.2 Public Education and Interpretation

3.3 HPMP Policies [*Programs for management/protection of historic properties*]

3.3.1 Management Standards for Historic Properties [*This section includes guidelines for how Douglas PUD will protect historic properties when conducting routine activities*]

3.3.2 Inadvertent Discoveries and Emergency Situations

3.3.2.1 Protocol for Discovery of Archaeological Resources

3.3.2.2 Protocol for Discovery of Human Remains

3.3.2.3 Protocol for Emergency Situations

3.4 Management Standards for Traditional Cultural Properties

3.5 Action for Individual Sites

3.6 Historic Structures

4.0 Consultation [*How Douglas PUD will consult during the new license*]

5.0 HPMP Implementation Schedule

6.0 Literature Cited

Appendix A – Consultation Record

Appendix B – Legislative Mandates

Appendix C – Historic Properties Studies Conducted in the Wells Project Area

Appendix D – Historic Properties Identified Within the Wells Project APE

Appendix E – Monitoring Protocol

Appendix F – Treatment for Individual Historic Properties